

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	O. F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/775,272 02/10/2004		02/10/2004	Roberto Semeia	KAR 002	KAR 002 1277	
39232	7590	07/06/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	Associates AVE. STE	H378	HEPPERLE, S	HEPPERLE, STEPHEN M		
LA JOLLA, CA 92037				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			,	3753		
				DATE MAILED: 07/06/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/775,272	SEMEIA, ROBERTO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Stephen M. Hepperle	3753		

	Stephen M. Hepperle	3753						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 16 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered b	ecause					
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO	TE below);						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	w);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
appeal; and/or	corresponding number of finally rei	acted claims						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ecteu ciairiis.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		omnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)					
		inpliant Amendment	(1 102 024).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	 Nowable if submitted in a senarate	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s).	nowable if subtritted if a separate,	amery med american	one cancoming the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to: 4-21 and 23.								
Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,22 and 24.								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidate	vit or other evidence	is necessary and					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.								
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).								
13. Other:		/						
		Stephen M. Heppe Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3753						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the change from "restraining the radial movement" to "preventing the lateral movement" is a new issue that requires further searh and/or consideration. It also may be a new matter or enabl ment issue, as "preventing" lateral movement would require a contact fit on opposing ends of both tabs, which would prevent movement of the valve.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applied references are seen as very relevant. Both references address the same problem as applicant, and the examiner still sees that one of ordinary skill in the art would see that Turney's grooves in an obvious substitution for the square cutting arrangement of MacNiel It is also seen that some minimal excess width of the slots of applicant's device is necessary to permit free movement of the valve. Turney's disclosure of that (referenced by applicant in his remarks) is seen as essentially necessary means to permit movement..